



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,503	09/19/2003	Jen-Lin Chao	252011-1660	8959
47390	7590	12/22/2006	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HOSTEMEYER & RISLEY LLP			BELL, CORY C	
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY				
SUITE 1750			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30339				2164
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS		12/22/2006		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,503	CHAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cory C. Bell	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/24/2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15-21,23,24 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-13, 15-21, 23-24, and 26-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-21, 23-24, and 26-30 have been examined.
2. Claims 4, 14, 22, 25 are cancelled

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- a. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a)A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23-24, 26-28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6567928, known hereafter as Lyle, in view of US 5293615, known hereafter as Amada.

Claim 1 is rejected for the following reasons:

A system of data management for a plurality of correlated data records, comprising:

a data verification module, verifying the data records according to the data correlations and producing a plurality of verification results, each of the verification results corresponds to one of the data records(Figure 11);

a data notation module, coupled to the data verification module, noting the verification results in the corresponding data records(Col 6 lines 48-510) ; and

a data management module, coupled to the data notation module, managing the data records according to the verification results(Col 6 lines 54-57)

wherein each of the verification results includes one of valid and invalid, each of the verification result includes valid for the corresponding data record when the corresponding data record can be applied to a data application module and each of the verification result includes invalid for the corresponding data record when the corresponding data record can not be applied to the data application module.(Col 6 lines 48-63)

Lyle fails to expressly disclose Sequential correlations in the database system as claimed, however this is taught in Amada Col 22, lines 29-37. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the inventions to use these correlations when invalidating records, as records that are dependant upon a record must themselves be invalid, and these types of records are well known and provide increased functionality in data manipulation in a database.

4. Claim 2 is rejected for the following reasons:

The system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising the data application module, coupled to the data verification module and the data notation module, applying the data records whose verification results include valid. (Col 6 lines 57-63)

5. Claim 3 is rejected for the following reasons:

6. 3. The system as claimed in claim 2, wherein the data correlations are established according to correlations between the data records applied to the data application modules (Data inherently has correlations for example Col 6 lines 61-63, talks about the object being in a table and thus having correlations).

7. Claim 5 is rejected for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2164

8. 5. The system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the data correlations are parallel only(The cited. records don't show sequential-dependence and are therefore parallel only correlations).

9. Claim 6 is rejected for the following reasons:

10. Lyle teaches parallel records see claim 5, and Amada teaches sequential see above.

11. Claim 7 is rejected for the following reasons:

12. 7. The system as claimed in claim 1, wherein each data record has a data record owner (Data records inherently have an Owner).

13. Claim 9 is rejected for the following reasons:

14. The system as claimed in claim 7, wherein data management is enabled by the data

15. management module deleting the data records (Col 8 lines 31-34).

16. Claim 10 is rejected for the following reasons:

17. 10. The system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the data records are stored in at least one database (Col 7 lines 11-18).

18. **Claim 11** is rejected for the following reasons:

19. See claim 1 rejection.

20. **Claim 12** is rejected for the following reasons:

21. See claim 2 rejection.

22. **Claim 13** is rejected for the following reasons:

23. See claim 3 rejection.

24. **Claim 14** is rejected for the following reasons:

25. See claim 4 rejection.

26. **Claim 15** is rejected for the following reasons:

27. See claim 5 rejection.

28. **Claim 16** is rejected for the following reasons:

29. See claim 6 rejection.

30. **Claim 17** is rejected for the following reasons:

31. See claim 7 rejection.

32. **Claim 19** is rejected for the following reasons:

33. See claim 9 rejection.

34. **Claim 20** is rejected for the following reasons:

35. See claim 10 rejection.

36. **Claim 21** is rejected for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2164

37. A database, comprising: a data storage module, storing a plurality of correlated data records, and a data operation module, coupled to the data storage module, operating the data records(*Figure 4*).

38. **Claim 22** is rejected for the following reasons:

39. See claim 1 rejection.

40. **Claim 23** is rejected for the following reasons:

41. See claim 2 rejection.

42. **Claim 24** is rejected for the following reasons:

43. See claim 3 rejection.

44. **Claim 25** is rejected for the following reasons:

45. See claim 4 rejection.

46. **Claim 26** is rejected for the following reasons:

47. See claim 5 rejection.

48. **Claim 27** is rejected for the following reasons:

49. See claim 6 rejection.

Art Unit: 2164

50. **Claim 28** is rejected for the following reasons:

51. See claim 7 rejection.

52. **Claim 30** is rejected for the following reasons:

53. See claim 9 rejection.

54. Claims 8, 18, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6567928, known hereafter as Lyle, in view of US 5299615, known hereafter as Amada in further view of US Patent Number 6978262, known hereafter as Tsai.

55. Claims 8, 18, and 19 are rejected for the following reasons:

Lyle and Amada teaches the claims upon when these claims are dependant, but fails to expressly disclose wherein data management is enabled by the data management module sending the verification results to the data record owners. This is taught however in Tsai (Col 10 lines 37-51). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features, as they notify owners of invalid data so that valid data can be entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER